

Appl. No. 10/062,949
Amdt. dated March 31, 2006
Amendment under 37 CFR 1.116 Expedited Procedure
Examining Group 2136

PATENT

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-12 are pending in this application. The Office Action rejected claims 1-3, 5, 7, and 9-12 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Publication Application No. 2002/0059364 to Coulthard et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,572,025 to Nishikado et al. The Office Action rejected claim 4 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Publication Application No. 2002/0059364 to Coulthard et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,572,025 to Nishikado et al. in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,317,783 to Freishtat et al. The Office Action rejected claims 6 and 8 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Publication Application No. 2002/0059364 to Coulthard et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,572,025 to Nishikado et al. in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,647,200 to Tanaka. Claims 1, 2, 10, 11, and 12 have been amended. Claims 1-12 remain pending in this application after entry of this amendment. No new matter has been entered.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

The Office Action rejected claims 1-3, 5, 7, and 9-12 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Publication Application No. 2002/0059364 to Coulthard et al. (hereinafter Coulthard) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,572,025 to Nishikado et al. (hereinafter Nishikado). The Office Action alleges that the combination of references teach or disclose all of the claimed limitations of the corresponding claims and that one having ordinary skill in that art at the time of the invention would have been motivated to incorporate the teachings of Nishikado within the system of Coulthard. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections and request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections based on Coulthard in view of Nishikado.

The Office Action rejected claim 4 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Coulthard in view of Nishikado in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,317,783 to Freishtat et al. (hereinafter Freishtat). The Office Action alleges that the combination of references teach or disclose all of the claimed limitations of the corresponding claims and that one having ordinary skill in that art at the time of the invention would have been motivated to

Appl. No. 10/062,949
Amdt. dated March 31, 2006
Amendment under 37 CFR 1.116 Expedited Procedure
Examining Group 2136

PATENT

incorporate the teachings of Nishikado and Freishtat within the system of Coulthard. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections and request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections based on Coulthard in view of Nishikado in further view of Freishtat.

The Office Action rejected claims 6 and 8 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Coulthard in view of Nishikado in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,647,200 to Tanaka (hereinafter Tanaka). The Office Action alleges that the combination of references teach or disclose all of the claimed limitations of the corresponding claims and that one having ordinary skill in that art at the time of the invention would have been motivated to incorporate the teachings of Nishikado and Tanaka within the system of Coulthard. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections and request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections based on Coulthard in view of Nishikado in further view Tanaka.

To establish a prima facie case of obviousness, three basic criteria must be met. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings. Second, there must be reasonable expectation of success. Finally, the prior art reference, or references when combined, must teach or suggest all of the claim limitations. Applicants respectfully submit that Coulthard and Nishikado, either individually or in combination, fail to teach or suggest all of the claimed limitations from each of claims 1-3, 5, 7, and 9-12. Additionally, Applicants respectfully submit that Coulthard, Nishikado, and Freishtat, either individually or in combination, fail to teach or suggest all of the claimed limitations from each of claim 4. Furthermore, Applicants respectfully submit that Coulthard, Nishikado, and Tanaka, either individually or in combination, fail to teach or suggest all of the claimed limitations from each of claims 6 and 8.

Claim 1

Claim 1 recites, in part, receiving discriminating information to be outputted with a verification result of authenticity based on the digital data, wherein the discriminating information can be discriminated only by a specific user who inputted the discriminating

Appl. No. 10/062,949
Amdt. dated March 31, 2006
Amendment under 37 CFR 1.116 Expedited Procedure
Examining Group 2136

PATENT

information. Claim 1 further recites, in part, when the verification result of the authenticity based on the digital data is outputted, reading out the discriminating information registered in said personal table for verification and outputting said discriminating information with said verification result on a display screen.

As discussed in previous responses, Coulthard does not disclose displaying discriminating information that can only be discriminated by a specific user as recited in claim 1. In Coulthard, the verification information can be obtained by any user who sends the specific content to the certification server. Thus, Coulthard does not teach or suggest displaying discriminating information that can only be discriminated by a specific user who inputted the discriminating information as recited in claim 1. Applicants submit that Nishikado does not cure the deficiencies of Coulthard.

Nishikado teaches a method of hiding information codes in an image, which cannot be detected by just seeing the image. (Nishikado: Col. 2, lines 41-43). Nishikado further teaches a method of authenticating a user by utilizing a credit card, wherein information for discriminating the user, such as passwords, an owners' name, a picture, date of birth, and a signature are stored in an image on the credit card according to the information hiding techniques. When an authentication terminal receives the credit card that a user hopes to use, an image capture section of the terminal captures the image stored on the credit card. The image is processed to obtain the passwords, the owner's name, the picture, the signature, and the like. To complete a transaction, the terminal requests the signature of the user of the credit card to be inputted into the terminal. The terminal then displays the inputted signature along with the information stored in the credit card. A computer system or store clerk matches the signature inputted by the user to the displayed information stored in the credit card. (Nishikado: Col. 26, lines 7-42; Col. 27, line 54 - Col. 29, line 51).

However, claim 1 recites displaying discriminating information that can be discriminated only by a specific user who inputted the discriminating information. In contrast, in Nishikado, any third party, such as the store clerk, can confirm the information stored on the credit card. In Nishikado, the terminal displays the owner's name, signature, picture, birth date,

Appl. No. 10/062,949
Amtdt. dated March 31, 2006
Amendment under 37 CFR 1.116 Expedited Procedure
Examining Group 2136

PATENT

etc. stored in the image in the credit card for discriminating the owner of the credit card to be confirmed by the store clerk. Additionally, in Nishikado, the computer system checks the inputted signature displayed by the terminal against the signature stored in the credit card. Thus, Nishikado does not teach or suggest displaying discriminating information that can be discriminated only by a specific user who inputted the discriminating information as recited in claim 1. Applicants respectfully submit that claim 1 is allowable.

Claims 2-3, 5, 7, and 9-12

Applicants submit that independent claims 2 and 10-12 are allowable for at least a similar rationale as discussed above for the allowability of claim 1. Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 2 and 10-12 are allowable over Coulthard in view of Nishikado. Applicants further submit that dependent claims 3, 5, 7, and 9 that depend from independent claims 1 or 2 are allowable for at least a similar rationale as discussed above for the allowability of claims 1 and 2. Applicants submit that dependent claims 3, 5, 7, and 9 are allowable for additional reasons.

Claim 4

Applicants submit that dependent claim 4 that depends from independent claims 1 or 2 is allowable for at least a similar rationale as discussed above for the allowability of claims 1 and 2. Applicants respectfully submit that Freishtat does not cure the deficiencies of Coulthard and Nishikado. Applicants further submit that dependent claim 4 is allowable for additional reasons.

Claims 6 and 8

Applicants submit that dependent claims 6 and 8 that depend from independent claims 1 or 2 is allowable for at least a similar rationale as discussed above for the allowability of claims 1 and 2. Applicants respectfully submit that Tanaka does not cure the deficiencies of

Appl. No. 10/062,949
Amdt. dated March 31, 2006
Amendment under 37 CFR 1.116 Expedited Procedure
Examining Group 2136

PATENT


Coulthard and Nishikado. Applicants further submit that dependent claims 6 and 8 are allowable for additional reasons.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicants believe all claims now pending in this Application are in condition for allowance and an action to that end is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, please telephone the undersigned at 650-326-2400.

Respectfully submitted,



Sean F. Parmenter
Reg. No. 53,437

TOWNSEND and TOWNSEND and CREW LLP
Two Embarcadero Center, Eighth Floor
San Francisco, California 94111-3834
Tel: 650-326-2400
Fax: 415-576-0300
SFP:am
60735115 v1